

JAPANESE INDICTMENT

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST.

No.1.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, CANADA, THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE, THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, INDIA, AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES.

- AGAINST -

ARAKI, Sadao; DOHIHARA, Kenji; HASHIMOTO, Kingoro; HATA, Shunroku; HIRANUMA, Kiichiro; HIROTA, Koki; HOSHINO, Naoki; ITAGAKI, Seishiro; KAYA, Okinori; KIDO, Koichi; KIMURA, Heitaro; KOISO, Kuniaki; MATSUI, Iwane; MATSUOKA, Yosuke; MINAMI, Jiro; MUTO, Akira; NAGANO, Osami; OKA, Takasumi; OKAWA, Shumei; OSHIMA, Hiroshi; SATO, Kenryo; SHIGEMITSU, Mamoru; SHIMADA, Shigetaro; SHIRATORI, Toshio; SUZUKI, Teiichi; TOGO, Shigenori; TOJO, Hideki; UMEZU, Yoshijiro.

Defendants.

INDICTMENT.

In the years hereinafter referred to in this Indictment the internal and foreign policies of Japan were dominated and directed by a criminal militaristic clique, and such policies were the cause of serious world troubles, aggressive wars, and great damage to the interests of peace-loving peoples, as well as the interests of the Japanese people themselves.

The mind of the Japanese people was systematically poisoned with harmful ideas of the alleged racial superiority of Japan over other peoples of Asia and even of the whole world. Such parliamentary institutions as existed in Japan were used as implements for widespread aggression, and a system similar to those then established by Hitler and the Nazi party in Germany and by the Fascist party in Italy was introduced. The economic and financial resources of Japan were to a large extent mobilized for war aims, to the detriment of the welfare of the Japanese people.

A conspiracy between the defendants, joined in by the rulers of other aggressive countries, namely, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, was entered into. The main objects of this conspiracy was to secure the domination and exploitation by the aggressive States of the rest of the world, and to this end to commit, or encourage the commission of crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity as defined in the Charter of this Tribunal, thus threatening and injuring the basic principles of liberty and respect for the human personality.

In the promotion and accomplishment of that scheme, these defendants, taking advantage of their power and their official positions and their own personal prestige and influence, intended to and did plan, prepare, initiate, or wage aggressive war against the United States of America, the Republic of China, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, India, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and other peaceful nations, in violation of international law, as well as in violation of sacred treaty commitments, obligations and assurances; such plan contemplated and carried out the violation of recognized customs and conventions of war by murdering, maiming and ill-treating prisoners of war, civilian internees, and persons on the high seas, denying them adequate food, shelter, clothing, medical care, or other appropriate attention, forcing them to labour under inhumane conditions, and subjecting them to indignities; exploit to Japan's benefit the manpower and economic resources of the vanquished nations, plundering public and private property, wantonly destroying cities, towns and villages beyond any justification of military necessity; perpetrate mass murder, rape, pillage, brigandage, torture, and other barbaric cruelties upon the helpless civilian population of the over-run countries; increase the

influence and control of the military and naval groups over Japanese government officials and agencies; psychologically prepare Japanese public opinion for aggressive warfare by establishing so-called Assistance Societies, teaching nationalistic policies of expansion, disseminating war propaganda, and exercising strict control over the press and radio; set up "puppet" governments in conquered countries; conclude military alliances with Germany and Italy to enhance by military might Japan's programme of expansion.

Therefore, the above named Nations by their undersigned representatives, duly appointed to represent their respective Governments in the investigation of the charges against and the prosecution of the Major War Criminals, pursuant to the Potsdam Declaration of the 20th July, 1945, and the Instrument of Surrender of the 2nd September, 1945, and the Charter of the Tribunal, hereby accuse as guilty, in the respects hereinafter set forth, of Crimes against Peace, War Crimes, and Crimes against Humanity, and of Common Plans or Conspiracies to commit those Crimes, all as defined in the Charter of the Tribunal, and accordingly name as Defendants in this cause and as indicted on the Counts hereinafter set out in which their names respectively appear, all the above-named individuals.

GROUP ONE: CRIMES AGAINST PEACE.

The following counts charge Crimes against Peace, being acts for which it is charged that the persons named and each of them are individually responsible in accordance with Article 5 and particularly Article 5(a) and (b) of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, and in accordance with International Law, or either of them.

COUNT 1.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons, between the 1st January, 1928, and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was that Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of East Asia and of the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and of all countries and islands therein and bordering thereon and for that purpose should alone or in combination with other countries having similar objects, or who could be induced or coerced to join therein, wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against any country or countries which might oppose that purpose.

The whole of the Particulars in Appendix A, of the Treaty Articles in Appendix B, and of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 2.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons, between the 1st January, 1928, and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was that Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of the provinces of Liaoning, Kirin, Heilungkiang and Jehol, being parts of the Republic of China, either directly or by establishing a separate state under the control of Japan, and for that purpose should wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

The whole of the Particulars in Appendix A, the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B: Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive, 8 to 14 inclusive, 22 to 30 inclusive, 32 to 35 inclusive; and the following Assurances in appendix C: Nos. 1 to 8 inclusive, relate to this Count.

COUNT 3.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons, between the 1st January, 1928, and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was that Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of the Republic of China, either directly or by establishing a separate state or states under the control of Japan, and for that purpose should wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

The whole of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 2, relate to this Count.

COUNT 4.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons, between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was that Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of East Asia and of the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and of all countries and islands therein or bordering thereon, and for that purpose should alone or in combination with other countries having similar objects, or who could be induced or coerced to join therein, wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations (which expression wherever used in this Indictment includes the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Burma, the Malay States, and all other parts of the British Empire not separately represented in the League of Nations), the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of China, the Republic of Portugal, the Kingdom of Thailand, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or such of them as might oppose that purpose.

The whole of the Particulars in Appendix A, and of the Treaty Articles in Appendix B and of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 5.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons, between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was that Germany, Italy and Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of the whole world, each having special domination in its own sphere, the sphere of Japan covering East Asia, the Pacific and Indian Oceans and all countries and islands therein or bordering thereon, and for that purpose should mutually assist one another to wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against any countries which might oppose that purpose, and particularly against the

United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of China, the Republic of Portugal, the Kingdom of Thailand, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The whole of the Particulars in Appendix A, and of the Treaty Articles in Appendix B, and of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 6.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 1 to 6 inclusive, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 2, relate to this Count.

COUNT 7.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the United States of America.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 10 inclusive, 17 to 19 inclusive, 22 to 35, inclusive and 37; and the whole of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 8.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations not the subject of separate counts in this Indictment.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; and the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1, 2, 5, 10 to 19 inclusive, 22 to 30 inclusive, 32 to 35 inclusive, 37 and 38; and the whole of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 9.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Commonwealth of Australia.

The same Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 8, relate to this Count.

COUNT 10.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd

September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against New Zealand.

The same Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 8, relate to this Count.

COUNT 11.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against Canada.

The same Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 8, relate to this Count.

COUNT 12.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against India.

The same Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 8, relate to this Count.

COUNT 13.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The same Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 7, relate to this Count.

COUNT 14.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 10 to 18 inclusive, 20, 22 to 30 inclusive, 32 to 35 inclusive, 37 and 38; and the following Assurances in Appendix C, Nos. 10 to 15 inclusive, relate to this Count.

COUNT 15.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of France.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 10 to 19 inclusive, 22 to 30 inclusive, and 32 to 38 inclusive, and the following Assurances in Appendix C, Nos. 14 and 15, relate to this Count.

COUNT 16.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd

September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the Kingdom of Thailand.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10; and the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 3, 4, 5, 10 and 32 to 38 inclusive, relate to this Count.

COUNT 17.

All the Defendants between the 1st January, 1923 and the 2nd September, 1945, planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 1 to 8 inclusive, and the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 10 to 18 inclusive, 32 to 35 inclusive, 39 to 47 inclusive and Assurance No. 13 in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 18.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIMARA, HASHIMOTO, HIRANUMA, ITAGAKI, KOISO, MINAMI, OKAWA, SHIGEMITSU, TOJO and UMEZU, on or about the 18th September, 1931, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

Section 1 of the Particulars in Appendix A; and the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 11 to 14 inclusive, 22, 23, 25, 30, 40 to 43 inclusive, relate to this Count.

COUNT 19.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIMARA, HASHIMOTO, HATA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KAYA, KIDO, MATSUI, MUTO, SUZUKI, TOJO and UMEZU, on or about the 7th July, 1937, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

Section 2 of the Particulars in Appendix A; the same Treaty Articles as in Count 18 and the following Assurances in Appendix C, Nos. 3, 4 and 5, relate to this Count.

COUNT 20.

The Defendants DOHIMARA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO and TOJO, on or about the 7th December, 1941, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the United States of America.

Section 9 of the Particulars in Appendix A, the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 9 inclusive; 19, 22 to 30 inclusive, 33, 34 and 37; and the whole of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 21.

The same Defendants as in Count 20 on or about the 7th December, 1941, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 20, relate to this Count.

COUNT 22.

The same Defendants as in Count 20, on or about the 7th December, 1941, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Section 9 of the Particulars in Appendix A, the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 19, 22 to 30 inclusive, 33 and 37; and the whole of the Assurances in Appendix C, relate to this Count.

COUNT 23.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KIDO, MATSUOKA, MUTO, NAGANO, SHIGEMITSU and TOJO, on or about the 22nd September, 1940, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of France.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 15, relate to this Count.

COUNT 24.

The same Defendants as in Count 20 on or about the 7th December, 1941, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Kingdom of Thailand.

Section 7 of the Particulars in Appendix A, and the following Treaty Articles in Appendix B, Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, 33, 34, 36, 37 and 38, relate to this Count.

COUNT 25.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HATA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KIDO, MATSUOKA, MATSUI, SHIGEMITSU, SUZUKI and TOGO, during July and August, 1938, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances by attacking the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the area of Lake Khasan.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 17, relate to this Count.

COUNT 26.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HATA, HIRANUMA, ITAGAKI, KIDO, KOISO, MATSUI, MATSUOKA, MUTO, SUZUKI, TOGO, TOJO and UMEZU, during the summer of 1939, initiated a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, by attacking the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic in the area of the Khackhin-Gol River.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 17, relate to this Count.

COUNT 27.

All the Defendants between the 18th September, 1931 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the Republic of China.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 2, relate to this Count.

COUNT 28.

All the Defendants between the 7th July, 1937 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of China.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 2, relate to this Count.

COUNT 29.

All the Defendants between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the United States of America.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 4 to 10 inclusive; and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 20 relate to this Count.

COUNT 30.

All the Defendants between the 7th December, 1941, and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties agreements and assurances, against the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 29, relate to this Count.

COUNT 31.

All the Defendants between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The following Sections of the Particulars in Appendix A, Nos. 4 to 10 inclusive; and the same Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 22, relate to this Count.

COUNT 32.

All the Defendants between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 14, relate to this Count.

COUNT 33.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIMARA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KIDO, MATSUOKA, MUTO, NAGANO, SHIGEMITSU and TOJO, on and after the 22nd September, 1940, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances, against the Republic of France.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 15, relate to this Count.

COUNT 34.

All the Defendants between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements, and assurances, against the

Kingdom of Thailand.

The same Particulars and Treaty Articles as in Count 24, relate to this Count.

COUNT 35.

The same Defendants as in Count 25, during the summer of 1938, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 17, relate to this Count.

COUNT 36.

The same Defendants as in Count 26, during the summer of 1939, waged a war of aggression and a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances against the Mongolian People's Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The same Particulars, Treaty Articles and Assurances as in Count 17, relate to this Count.

GROUP TWO: MURDER.

The following Counts charge the crimes of murder, and conspiracy to murder, being acts for which it is charged that the persons named and each of them are individually responsible, being at the same time Crimes against Peace, Conventional War Crimes, and Crimes against Humanity, contrary to all the paragraphs of Article 5 of the said Charter, to International Law, and to the domestic laws of all the countries where committed, including Japan, or to one or more of them.

COUNT 37.

The Defendants DOHIHARA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO and TOJO, together with divers other persons between the 1st June, 1940, and the 8th December, 1941, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was unlawfully to kill and murder the persons described below, by initiating unlawful hostilities against the United States of America, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Thailand, and unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory, ships and airplanes of the said nations or some of them at times when Japan would be at peace with the said nations.

The persons intended to be killed and murdered were all such persons, both members of the armed forces of the said nations and civilians, as might happen to be in the places at the times of such attacks.

The said hostilities and attacks were unlawful because they were breaches of Treaty Article 5 in Appendix B, and the accused and the said armed forces of Japan could not therefore, acquire the rights of lawful belligerents.

The accused and each of them intended that such hostilities should be initiated in breach of such Treaty Article, or were reckless whether such Treaty Article would be violated or not.

COUNT 38.

The Defendants DOHIMURA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, MATSUOKA, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO and TOJO, together with divers other persons between the 1st June, 1940 and the 8th December, 1941, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was unlawfully to kill and murder the persons described below, by initiating unlawful hostilities against the United States of America, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Thailand, and unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory, ships and airplanes of the said nations or some of them.

The persons intended to be killed and murdered were all such persons, both members of the armed forces of the said nations and civilians, as might happen to be in the places at the times of such attacks.

The said hostilities and attacks were unlawful because they were breaches of Treaty Articles 6, 7, 19, 33, 34, and 36 in Appendix B and the accused and the said armed forces of Japan could not therefore, acquire the rights of lawful belligerents.

The accused and each of them intended that such hostilities should be initiated in breach of such Treaty Articles, or were reckless whether such Treaty Articles or any of them would be violated or not.

COUNT 39.

The same Defendants as in Count 38, under the circumstances alleged in Counts 37 and 38, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory, ships and airplanes of the United States of America, with which nation Japan was then at peace, at Pearl Harbour, Territory of Hawaii, on the 7th December, 1941, at about 0755 hours (Pearl Harbour time), unlawfully killed and murdered Admiral Kidd and about 4,000 other members of the naval and military forces of the United States of America and certain civilians whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 40.

The same Defendants as in Count 38, under the circumstances alleged in Counts 37 and 38, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory and airplanes of the British Commonwealth of Nations, with which nations Japan was then at peace, at Kota Bharu, Kelantan, on the 8th December, 1941, at about 0025 hours (Singapore time), unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of the British Commonwealth of Nations whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 41.

The same Defendants as in Count 38, under the circumstances alleged in Counts 37 and 38, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory, ships and airplanes of the British Commonwealth of Nations, with which nations Japan was then at peace, at Hong Kong, on the 8th December, 1941, at about 0800 hours (Hong Kong time), unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of the British Commonwealth of Nations, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 42.

The same Defendants as in Count 38, under the circumstances alleged in Counts 37 and 38, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack H.M.S. PETREL, a ship of the British Commonwealth of Nations, with which nations Japan was then at peace, at Shanghai on the 8th December, 1941, at about 0300 hours (Shanghai time), unlawfully killed and murdered three members of the naval forces of the British Commonwealth of Nations, whose names are at present unknown.

COUNT 43.

The same Defendants as in Count 38, under the circumstances alleged in Counts 37 and 38, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, with which nation Japan was then at peace, at Davao, on the 8th December, 1941, at about 1000 hours (Manila time) unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of the United States of America and of the armed forces and civilians of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 44.

All the Defendants together with divers other persons between the 18th September, 1931 and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was to procure and permit the murder on a wholesale scale of prisoners of war, members of the armed forces of countries opposed to Japan who might lay down their arms, and civilians, who might be in the power of Japan, on land or sea, in territories occupied by Japan, and crews of ships destroyed by Japanese forces, in ruthless pursuit of victory in the unlawful wars in which Japan was, or would, during the said period be engaged.

COUNT 45.

The Defendants ARAKI, HASHIMOTO, HATA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, ITAGAKI, KAYA, KIDO, MATSUI, MUTO, SUZUKI and UMEZU, on the 12th December, 1937, and succeeding days, by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the City of Nanking in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered many thousands of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 46.

The same Defendants as in Count 45, on the 21st October, 1938 and succeeding days, by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the City of Canton in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered large numbers of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 47.

The same Defendants as in Count 45, prior to the 27th October, 1938, and on succeeding days, by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the City of Hankow in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the

inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered large numbers of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 48.

The Defendants HATA, KIDO, KOISO, SATO, SHIGEMITSU, TOJO and UMEZU, prior to the 18th June, 1944, and on succeeding days, by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the City of Changsha in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered many thousands of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 49.

The Same Defendants as in Count 48, prior to the 8th August, 1944, and on succeeding days, by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the City of Hengyang in the Province of Hunan in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered large numbers of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 50.

The same Defendants as in Count 48, prior to the 10th November, 1944, and on succeeding days by unlawfully ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the Cities of Kweilin and Liuchow in the Province of Kwangsi in breach of the Treaty Articles mentioned in Count 2 hereof and to slaughter the inhabitants contrary to international law, unlawfully killed and murdered large numbers of civilians and disarmed soldiers of the Republic of China, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 51.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HATA, HIRANUMA, ITAGAKI, KIDO, KOISO, MATSUI, MATSUOKA, MUTO, SUZUKI, TOGO, TOJO and UMEZU, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territories of Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with which nations Japan was then at peace, in the region of the Khalkhin-Gol River in the summer of 1939, unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose names and number are at present unknown.

COUNT 52.

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HATA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KIDO, MATSUOKA, MATSUI, SHIGEMITSU, SUZUKI and TOJO, by ordering, causing and permitting the armed force of Japan to attack the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with which nation Japan was then at peace, unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose names and number are at present unknown.

GROUP THREE: CONVENTIONAL WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

The following Counts charge conventional War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, being acts for which it is charged that the persons named and each of them are individually responsible, in accordance with Article 5 and particularly Article 5 (b) and (c) of the Charter of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, and in accordance with International Law, or either of them

COUNT 53.

The Defendants, DOHIHARA, HATA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, KOISO, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIGEMITSU, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO, TOJO and UMEZU, together with divers other persons, between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, participated as leaders, organisers, instigators, or accomplices in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy, and are responsible for all acts performed by themselves or by any person in execution of such plan.

The object of such plan or conspiracy was to order, authorise and permit the Commanders-in-Chief of the several Japanese naval and military forces in each of the several theatres of war in which Japan was then engaged, and the officials of the Japanese War Ministry, and the persons in charge of each of the camps and labour units for prisoners of war and civilian internees in territories of or occupied by Japan and the military and civil police of Japan, and their respective subordinates frequently and habitually to commit the breaches of the Laws and Customs of War, as contained in and proved by the Conventions, assurances and practices referred to in Appendix D, against the armed forces of the countries hereinafter named and against many thousands of prisoners of war and civilians then in the power of Japan belonging to the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the Republic of China, the Republic of Portugal and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and that the Government of Japan should abstain from taking adequate steps in accordance with the said Conventions and assurances and Laws and customs of War, in order to secure observance and prevent breaches thereof.

In the case of the Republic of China, the said plan or conspiracy began on the 18th September, 1931, and the following Defendants participated therein in addition to those above-named: ARAKI, HASHIMOTO, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, MATSUI, MATSUOKA, MINAMI.

COUNT 54.

The Defendants DOHIHARA, HATA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, KOISO, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIGEMITSU, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO, TOJO and UMEZU, between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, ordered, authorised and permitted the same persons as mentioned in Count 53 to commit the offences therein mentioned and thereby violated the laws of War.

In the case of the Republic of China the said orders, authorities and permissions were given in a period beginning on the 18th September, 1931, and the following Defendants were responsible for the same in addition to those named above: ARAKI, HASHIMOTO, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, MATSUI, MATSUOKA, MINAMI.

COUNT 55.

The Defendants DOHIHARA, HATA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KAYA, KIDO, KIMURA, KOISO, MUTO, NAGANO, OKA, OSHIMA, SATO, SHIGEMITSU, SHIMADA, SUZUKI, TOGO, TOJO and UMEZU, between the 7th December, 1941 and the 2nd September, 1945, being by virtue of their respective offices responsible for securing the observance of the said Conventions and assurances and the Laws and Customs of War in respect of the armed forces in the countries hereinafter named and in respect of many thousands of prisoners of war and civilians then in the power of Japan belonging to the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the Republic of China, the Republic of Portugal and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deliberately and recklessly disregarded their legal duty to take adequate steps to secure the observance and prevent breaches thereof, and thereby violated the laws of war.

In the case of the Republic of China, the said offence began on the 18th September, 1931, and the following Defendants were responsible for the same in addition to those named above: ARAKI, HASHIMOTO, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, MATSUI, MATSUOKA, MINAMI.

Wherefore, this Indictment is lodged with the Tribunal, and the charges herein made against the above-named Defendants are hereby presented to the Tribunal.

Joseph B. Keenan

Chief of Counsel, acting on behalf of the
United States of America.

Hsiang Che-Chun

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Republic of China.

A.S. Comyns Carr

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the United
Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

S.A. Golunsky

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A.J. Mansfield

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Commonwealth of Australia.

H.G. Nolan

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of Canada.

Robert Omato

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Republic of France.

W.G.F. Boegerhoff Mulder

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Kingdom of the Netherlands.

R.H. Quilliam

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of
New Zealand.

p.p. Govinda Menon,
A.S. Comyns Carr

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of India.

Pedro Lopez

Associate Counsel, acting on behalf of the
Commonwealth of the Philippines.

APPENDIX A.

Summarized Particulars showing the principal matters and Events upon which the Prosecution will rely in support of the several Counts of the Indictment in Group One.

SECTION 1.

MILITARY AGGRESSION IN MANCHURIA.

From January 1st, 1928, onwards there was a plot in the Japanese Army, and particularly in the Kwantung Army, supported by certain civilians, to create an incident in Manchuria, which should form a pretext for Japan to conquer, occupy and exploit that Country as the first step in a scheme of domination which later extended to other parts of China to the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and ultimately to a wider field, aiming to make Japan a dominant power in the World.

The major events in the execution of it were:

About 18th September, 1931: Following a long period of infiltration and consequent friction, Japanese troops blew up a portion of the South Manchurian Railway, falsely accused Chinese troops of doing so, attacked them, and thereafter progressively and rapidly carried out a Military occupation of the Chinese provinces of Liaoning, Kirin, Heilungkiang and Jehol (the north-eastern provinces.)

About 3rd January, 1932: Japanese forces occupied Chinchow in spite of assurance given by their Foreign Office to the United States on 24th November, 1931, that they would not do so.

Beginning about 18th January, 1932, Japanese naval, and later military forces, attacked the Chinese in Shanghai.

About 28th to 29th January, 1932: Japanese bombed Chapei at 12.15 a.m.

About 1st Feb. 1932: Japanese warships shelled Nanking.

During 1932, Japan set up a separate puppet Government in the said Provinces and on 15th September, 1932, officially recognized it.

The Japanese Government which came into power on 13th December, 1931, and all subsequent Japanese Governments adopted, supported and continued this aggression and its gradual extension over other parts of China.

Japan delivered no declaration of War against China, made no effort to settle the alleged dispute by pacific means, or by mediation or arbitration, rejected on 5th February, 1932, an offer of mediation by the United States, Great Britain and France, refused to adopt the report and recommendations of the Lytton Commission appointed by the League of Nations of which Japan and China were members, or the resolutions of the League, and on 27th March, 1933, resigned from the League.

On 18th April, 1934, Japan announced her absolute opposition to any foreign interference in China other than her own.

On 1st March, 1934, Japan caused Henry Pu Yi to be installed as the nominal ruler of the so-called State of Manchukuo. Nevertheless large Japanese armies continued down to the 2nd September, 1945, to be maintained in these territories, using them as a base for further aggression, and to control, together with Japanese civilian officials, the whole Government, industry and finance thereof.

SECTION 2.

MILITARY AGGRESSION IN THE REST OF CHINA.

Japanese aggression against China entered a new phase on July 7th, 1937, when her army invaded China south of the Great Wall, and her government adopted, supported and continued the aggression. All subsequent Japanese Governments did the same.

Subsequent major events in this phase were:

About 19th to 25th September, 1937, Japanese forces bombed Hanking and Canton, and deliberately killed large numbers of civilians.

About 13th December, 1937, Japanese forces captured Hanking, slaughtered many thousands of civilians and committed other outrages.

During 1940, Japan set up a separate puppet Government in those parts of China (other than the four north-eastern provinces above-mentioned) which she then occupied, claiming to be the "National Government of the Republic of China", and about 30th November, 1940, officially recognized it.

Again Japan delivered no declaration of war on China, made no attempt to settle the alleged dispute by pacific means, or by mediation or arbitration, refused on 25th September, 1937, to participate in the Far Eastern Advisory Committee of the League of Nations, refused on 27th October and again on 12th November, 1937, to attend the Conference held at Brussels of the other signatories to the Nine-Power Treaty of 6th February, 1922, or to discuss its application, refused on 22nd September, 1938, to sit with the League of Nations to mediate her dispute with China, and on 4th November, 1938, declared that the said Nine-Power Treaty was obsolete.

Japan continued her military aggression in China by capturing, among other cities, Hankow on the 27th October, 1938; Changsha on the 10th June, 1941; Hengyang on the 8th August, Kweilin on the 10th November and Liuchow on the 11th November of the same year; and deliberately killed large numbers of civilians and committed other outrages in each of the cities afore-mentioned.

SECTION 3.

ECONOMIC AGGRESSION IN CHINA AND GREATER EAST ASIA.

During the period covered by this Indictment, Japan established a general superiority of rights in favour of her own nationals, which effectively created monopolies in commercial, industrial and financial enterprises, first in Manchuria and later in other parts of China which came under her domination, and exploited those regions not only for the enrichment of Japan and those of her nationals participating in those enterprises, but as part of a scheme to weaken the resistance of China, to exclude other Nations and nationals, and to provide funds and munitions for further aggression.

This plan, as was the intention of some at least of its originators, both on its economic and military side, gradually came to embrace similar designs on the remainder of East Asia and Oceania.

Later it was officially expanded into the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Scheme" (a title designed to cover up a scheme for complete Japanese domination of those areas) and Japan declared that this was the ultimate purpose of the military campaign.

The same organizations as are mentioned in Section 4 hereof were used for the above purposes.

SECTION 4.

METHODS OF CORRUPTION AND COERCION IN CHINA AND OTHER OCCUPIED TERRITORIES.

During the whole period covered by this Indictment, successive

SECTION 2.

MILITARY AGGRESSION IN THE REST OF CHINA.

Japanese aggression against China entered a new phase on July 7th, 1937, when her army invaded China south of the Great Wall, and her government adopted, supported and continued the aggression. All subsequent Japanese Governments did the same.

Subsequent major events in this phase were:

About 19th to 25th September, 1937, Japanese forces bombed Hanking and Canton, and deliberately killed large numbers of civilians.

About 13th December, 1937, Japanese forces captured Nanking, slaughtered many thousands of civilians and committed other outrages.

During 1940, Japan set up a separate puppet Government in those parts of China (other than the four north-eastern provinces above-mentioned) which she then occupied, claiming to be the "National Government of the Republic of China", and about 30th November, 1940, officially recognized it.

Again Japan delivered no declaration of war on China, made no attempt to settle the alleged dispute by pacific means, or by mediation or arbitration, refused on 25th September, 1937, to participate in the Far Eastern Advisory Committee of the League of Nations, refused on 27th October and again on 12th November, 1937, to attend the Conference held at Brussels of the other signatories to the Nine-Power Treaty of 6th February, 1922, or to discuss its application, refused on 22nd September, 1938, to sit with the League of Nations to mediate her dispute with China, and on 4th November, 1938, declared that the said Nine-Power Treaty was obsolete.

Japan continued her military aggression in China by capturing, among other cities, Hankow on the 27th October, 1938; Changsha on the 18th June, 1944; Hengyang on the 8th August, Kweilin on the 10th November and Liuchow on the 11th November of the same year; and deliberately killed large numbers of civilians and committed other outrages in each of the cities afore-mentioned.

SECTION 3.

ECONOMIC AGGRESSION IN CHINA AND GREATER EAST ASIA.

During the period covered by this Indictment, Japan established a general superiority of rights in favour of her own nationals, which effectively created monopolies in commercial, industrial and financial enterprises, first in Manchuria and later in other parts of China which came under her domination, and exploited those regions not only for the enrichment of Japan and those of her nationals participating in those enterprises, but as part of a scheme to weaken the resistance of China, to exclude other Nations and nationals, and to provide funds and munitions for further aggression.

This plan, as was the intention of some at least of its originators, both on its economic and military side, gradually came to embrace similar designs on the remainder of East Asia and Oceania.

Later it was officially expanded into the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Scheme" (a title designed to cover up a scheme for complete Japanese domination of those areas) and Japan declared that this was the ultimate purpose of the military campaign.

The same organizations as are mentioned in Section 4 hereof were used for the above purposes.

SECTION 4.

METHODS OF CORRUPTION AND COERCION IN CHINA AND OTHER OCCUPIED TERRITORIES.

During the whole period covered by this Indictment, successive

Japanese Governments, through their military and naval commanders and civilian agents in China and other territories which they had occupied or designed to occupy, pursued a systematic policy of weakening the native inhabitants will to resist by atrocities and cruelties, by force and threats of force, by bribery and corruption, by intrigue amongst local politicians and generals, by directly and indirectly encouraging increased production and importation of opium and other narcotics and by promoting the sale and consumption of such drugs among such people. The Japanese Government secretly provided large sums of money, which, together with profits from the government-sponsored traffic in opium and other narcotics and other trading activities in such areas, were used by agents of the Japanese government for all the above-mentioned purposes. At the same time, the Japanese Government was actively participating in the proceedings of the League of Nations Committee on Traffic in Opium and other Dangerous Drugs and, despite her secret activities above-mentioned, professed to the world to be co-operating fully with other member nations in the enforcement of treaties governing traffic in opium and other narcotics to which she was a party.

This participation in and sponsorship of illicit traffic in narcotics was effected through a number of Japanese governmental organizations such as the Manchurian Affairs Board, the China Affairs Board and the Southern Region Affairs Board, which were combined in 1942 to form the Greater East Asia Ministry, and numerous subsidiary organizations and trading companies in the various occupied and so-called independent (puppet) countries which were operated or supervised by senior officers or civilian appointees of the Army and the Navy.

Further, revenue from the above-mentioned traffic in opium and other narcotics was used to finance the preparation for and waging of the wars of aggression set forth in this Indictment and to establish and finance the puppet governments set up by the Japanese Government in the various occupied territories.

SECTION 5.

GENERAL PREPARATION FOR WAR.

With a view to future wars of aggression, and in order to prevent other nations from interference in her war of aggression already in progress against China, Japan from 1st January, 1932, onwards strengthened her naval, military, productive and financial preparations for war. In particular, but without limiting the above allegations:

(a) NAVAL:

About 29th December, 1934, she denounced the Washington Naval Treaty after an unsuccessful attempt to persuade the other Signatories to agree to a common upper limit of global naval tonnage for her own obvious advantage.

About 23rd June, 1936, she refused to adhere to the London Naval Treaty.

On or about 12th February, 1938, she refused to reveal her naval building plans on request by the United States, Britain and France.

At all times she secretly increased her naval strength.

At all times and especially throughout 1941, she made secret naval plans for the surprise attacks which ultimately took place on December 7th-8th, 1941, on Pearl Harbour, Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaya and Shanghai, and for similar attacks on other places in the Pacific and Indian Oceans and on the

territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(b) MILITARY:

Japan continually and progressively increased the size of her army not only as required for her war of aggression against China, but to a larger extent for the purpose of other wars of aggression. On the 6th April, 1939, she passed a general mobilization Law and thereafter put it into effect.

(c) NAVAL AND MILITARY:

Japan continually and progressively fortified the islands for which she held a mandate from the League of Nations.

Treaty Articles violated: 15, 17, 18, 31.

(c) PRODUCTIVE:

Japan continually and progressively increased her capacity for the production of munitions of war both on her own territory and in territories occupied or controlled by her, to an extent greater than was required for her war of aggression against China, for the purpose of other wars of aggression.

(e) FINANCIAL:

The finance for all the above-mentioned purposes was provided partly through the Budget by taxation, partly by loans, and partly from the profits of the exploitations as described in Section 3 hereof, and particularly of the sale of narcotics as described in Section 4 hereof.

SECTION 6.

THE ORGANIZATION OF JAPANESE POLITICS AND PUBLIC
OPINION FOR WAR.

Two provisions incorporated by ordinance or custom in the Japanese constitution gave to the militarists the opportunity of gaining control over the Governments which they seized during the period covered by this Indictment.

The first was that, not only had the Chiefs of Staff and other leaders of the Army and Navy direct access at all times to the Emperor, but they had the right to appoint and withdraw the War and Navy Ministers in any Government. Either of them could thus prevent a Government from being formed, or bring about its fall after it was formed. In May, 1936, this power was further increased by a regulation that the Army and Navy Ministers must be senior Officers on the active list. E.G., the fall of the Yonai Government on 21st July, 1940, and of the Third Konoye Government on the 16th October, 1941, were in fact brought about by the Army; in each case they were succeeded by Governments more subservient to the wishes of the Army.

The second was that, although the Diet had the right to reject a Budget, this did not give them control, because in that case the Budget of the preceding year remained in force.

During this period such free Parliamentary institutions as previously existed were gradually stamped out and a system similar to the Fascist or Nazi model introduced. This took definite shape with the formation on 12th October, 1940, of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association, and later of the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society.

During this period a vigorous campaign of incitement to expansion

was carried on, in the earlier part of the period by individual writers and speakers, but gradually this came to be organized by Government agencies, which also stamped out free speech and writing by opponents of this policy. A large number of Societies, some secret, was also formed both in the Army and Navy and among civilians, with similar objects. Opposition to this policy was also crushed by assassinations of leading politicians who were not considered sufficiently friendly to it, and by fear and threats of such assassinations. The civil and especially the military police were also used to suppress opposition to the war policy.

The educational systems, civil, military and naval, were used to inculcate a spirit of totalitarianism, aggression, desire for war, cruelty and hatred of potential enemies.

SECTION 7.

COLLABORATION BETWEEN JAPAN, GERMANY AND ITALY. AGGRESSION AGAINST FRENCH INDO-CHINA AND THAILAND.

Successive Japanese Governments from early in 1936 onwards, cultivated close relations with the totalitarian powers in Europe, Germany and Italy, which harboured similar designs in relation to the rest of the world to those of Japan in relation to East Asia and the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

On November 25th, 1936, they signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with a secret Protocol and a secret Military Treaty, directed ostensibly against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communism, but actually designed also as a prelude to joint aggressive action in general.

Various countries under the domination of Axis Powers, including the puppet governments of "Manchukuo" and the Nanking Regime in China, were admitted to the Anti-Comintern Pact.

Between the 1st January, 1938 and the 23rd August, 1939, extensive negotiations were conducted between Japan, Germany and Italy, for the establishment of an economic, political and military alliance.

On 26th August, 1939, Japan through her ambassador in Washington, assured the United States of America that she had decided to abandon any further negotiations with Germany and Italy relative to closer relations under the Anti-Comintern Pact.

Negotiations between Japan and Germany for the establishment of an economic, political and military alliance were resumed in July, 1940.

Between 13th August and 22nd September, 1940, after the Armistice in June, 1940, between Germany and the authority later to be known as the Vichy Government of France, subservient to Germany, and after the occupation by Germany of a large part of France, Japan induced and coerced the general government of French-Indo-China to enter into agreements with her for military and economic concessions in that country, and especially the northern part thereof. On 22nd September, 1940, notwithstanding agreements signed on the same day, Japanese troops attacked French Indo-Chinese units and were met with strong resistance.

On 27th September, 1940, Japan signed the Tri-Partite Pact with Germany and Italy.

In the early part of 1941, Japan, taking advantage of a boundary dispute raised by Thailand against French Indo-China, purported to act as mediator or arbitrator therein, but actually brought about a settlement unduly favourable to Thailand with a view to obtaining her aid in or submission to future aggression, and at the same time made further demands for military and economic concessions in French Indo-China.

The said settlements were finally concluded on 6th-9th May, 1941.

Commencing in the latter part of February, 1941, Japan and Germany conducted negotiations on the subject of Joint Military Action against Singapore and the territory of other nations.

On 1st July, 1941, Germany, Italy and all Governments subservient to them in other European countries, at the request of Japan, recognized the so-called "National Government of the Republic of China".

On the 12th July, 1940, a Friendship Treaty was signed between Japan and Thailand.

From May to July, 1941, Japan further induced and coerced the general Government of French Indo-China to allow Japanese troops to land, establish naval and air bases, and generally obtain control over Southern French Indo-China. The main purpose on this occasion was to provide bases for aggression directly against the British Commonwealth of Nations and the Dutch East Indies, and indirectly against the United States of America. The said agreements were finally concluded on July 21st and 29th, 1941, on which date Japanese forces landed at Saigon, established naval and air bases and generally took control of French Indo-China.

Throughout the above-mentioned dealings with French Indo-China, Japan used the help of Germany and Italy, by coercion upon the Vichy Government, as well as direct threats of illegal force, to attain her ends.

By way of reaction to this aggression and threat of further aggression, the United States of America on July 25th, and Great Britain on July 26th, froze the assets of Japan and China under their control, and applied other economic pressure against Japan.

On 25th November, 1941, Japan renewed the Anti-Comintern Pact, with secret clauses.

On or about the 1st December, 1941, Japan invoking the Tri-Partite Pact, requested Germany and Italy to declare War on the United States after the beginning of hostilities, and that a "No separate Peace Treaty" be entered into.

On 5th December, 1941, Japan assured the United States of America that troop movements in French Indo-China were precautionary measures.

On December 7th-8th, 1941, Japan made surprise attacks on territories of the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and Thailand, using in the two latter cases French Indo-China bases.

On the 11th December, 1941, Japan, Germany and Italy signed a "No Separate Peace Pact".

On 18th January, 1942, a Military Convention between Japan, Germany and Italy was signed in Berlin.

From 1936 to 1945 close military, naval, economic and diplomatic co-operation and exchange of information were maintained between the above three countries. At the request of Germany, Japan from the beginning of the war on December 7th-8th, 1941, adopted the German policy of ruthless submarine warfare and the destruction of crews of ships sunk or captured.

By the threatening attitude which Japan maintained from 1939 to 1941 against the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of France, and from 1939 to 1945 against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and by her increasing concentration of troops in regions convenient for attacks upon them, she directly assisted Germany and Italy in their wars against those nations, even while she remained nominally neutral.

SECTION 8.

AGGRESSION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION.

In the course of many years, Japan was continually preparing war and performing acts of aggression against the Soviet Union.

Having failed in her attempts to capture the Soviet Far East in the period between 1918-1922, Japan did not abandon the idea of capturing the Soviet areas situated east of the Lake Baykal.

Since 1928 the Japanese General Staff had been planning a war of aggression against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics eager to take advantage of a chance to start this war.

An important step in the preparation of a war of aggression against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the occupation of Manchuria in 1931, which as well as Korea was transformed into a military base for attacking the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in a number of years. Railroads and highways were constructed in Manchuria after 1931 of strategic importance and ran towards the frontier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The strength of the Kwantung Army had been increased from two divisions in 1931 to fifteen in 1941.

A great number of new airfields, fortified areas, dumps, barracks, sea and river ports destined to serve in the war of aggression against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were built.

In Manchuria the war industry developed at a fast rate. Areas adjacent to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics frontier were being colonized by Japanese reservists with the purpose of strengthening the Kwantung Army at the moment of mobilization. Propaganda in the press, by radio, etc., directed against the Soviet Union, was carried on intensely. On Manchurian territory Japan organized and supported on a large scale elements from Russian emigrants hostile to the Soviet Union and prepared them for hostile acts against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Japan systematically organized armed clashes on the frontier and organized acts of sabotage and terrorist acts on the Chinese Eastern Railroad.

In 1932, Japan twice rejected the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to conclude a non-aggression pact.

In 1938, Japan without declaring war, attacked the territory of the Soviet Union at the Lake Hassan.

In 1939 Japan again, without declaration of war, attacked the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic, an ally of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the Halkin-Gol River (Namanhan), and engaged the Mongolian People's Republic army and its allied Red Army. In both cases Japan pursued the aim of reconnoitering the strength of the Red Army by battle and capturing strategic positions for future war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Having been repulsed twice and having suffered heavy losses, Japan nevertheless did not stop the preparations for a surprise attack against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

While preparing for the war against the Soviet Union, Japan, during several years, carried on negotiations with Hitlerite Germany and Fascist Italy on a joint aggression. The principal stages, in this plot of aggressors, were the conclusion of the so-called Anti-Comintern Pact in 1936 and the signing of the Tri-Partite Pact of Japan, Germany and Italy in 1940, the aim of which was joint aggressive action of these countries against democratic powers, among them the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In March 1941, while being in Berlin for the purpose of plotting

with Hitler about a joint aggression against democratic countries, the defendant Matsuoka was informed by the German government about preparations by the latter for war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As early as the beginning of July, following a conclusion of the pact of neutrality on behalf of Japan on 13th April, 1941, after the treacherous attack of Germany against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Matsuoka officially declared to the Soviet Ambassador in Tokyo that the principal basis of the Japanese foreign policy was the alliance with Germany and that in case Germany addressed Japan with a request for help, the pact of neutrality with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would not present an obstacle for Japan to wage war on the side of Germany. In accordance with this, the governing militarist clique in Japan in the whole course of the war between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was openly hostile towards the Soviet Union; maintained a selected army on the Soviet frontiers and was an organizer of a widespread propaganda against the Soviet Union. Japan actively helped Hitlerite Germany, providing her with information regarding the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, organized pirate attacks on Soviet merchant shipping in the Far East by closing straits, establishing prohibited zones and special limited waterways.

To render help to Germany, Japan, after Germany's attack against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the summer of 1941, doubled the strength of her army in Manchuria and later on brought the strength of this army to a million men which necessitated maintaining considerable forces in the Far East by the Soviet Union instead of using them in the war against Germany.

In the same summer of 1941, Japan worked out a new plan of a surprise attack against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and kept the Kwantung Army fully prepared for such an attack. She was prevented from it, not by the pact of neutrality, which as it may be seen from above, Japan disregarded, but by the successes of the forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the war against Germany.

SECTION 9.

JAPAN, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES AND THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS.

The whole of the other Sections of this Appendix are relevant to this Section and are not repeated here.

From 1931 until December, 1941, relations between Japan on the one hand and the United States of America and Great Britain on the other continuously deteriorated because of Japan's aggression in East Asia and duplicity in international negotiations.

The United States of America and Great Britain frequently protested that Japan's military operations were a violation of the provisions of the treaties mentioned in Count 2 hereof, and called the attention of both China and Japan to their obligations thereunder. They also declared that they would not recognize any situation in Manchuria or elsewhere brought about by violations thereof.

Japan in unequivocal terms gave assurances that she had no territorial ambitions in China, that she would respect the open door policy in China. In spite of these assurances she set up a puppet regime in Manchukuo and proceeded to close the door to the United States of America and British trade.

After the consolidation of the Manchurian position Japan continued her aggressive policy in East Asia in spite of assurances that she had no territorial ambitions south of the Great Wall.

The United States and Great Britain endeavoured to convince Japan that her best interests lay in peace, but it was clear from her actions

that she intended to resort to force to gain neighbouring countries and territories.

During 1935, Japan increased her military and naval strength and undertook limited military activities to extend her domination over China. The United States of America and Great Britain continued to draw Japan's attention to her treaty obligations but this had no effect on her military activities.

In 1936, the United States of America endeavoured to get Japan to agree to the principle of equality in commercial and industrial spheres and not to resort to force to obtain preferential rights. This was also rejected by Japan.

In 1937, Japan declared that the principles of international relationship propounded by the United States of America were consistent with her own, but qualified this by stating that the objectives could only be obtained by an understanding of the particular circumstances of the East. In 1937 Japan commenced further military aggression in China and soon thereafter the United States of America offered her good offices in the dispute and appealed to both parties to refrain from war. This offer was not accepted by Japan and the appeal had no effect. In the same year Japan refused an invitation to attend the Brussels Conference called under the provisions of the Nine-Power Treaty. On August 26th, 1937, Japanese forces attacked cars belonging to the British Embassy in China, and on December 12th attacked warships belonging to the United States of America and Great Britain on the Yangtze.

At the end of 1938 Japan proclaimed her policy of a new order in East Asia and refused to give any unconditional assurance that the open door policy in China would be maintained.

Thereafter many interferences by Japan and Japanese controlled territories with the rights of the United States of America and British nationals took place and in July, 1939, the United States of America gave notice of termination of the 1911 commercial Treaty with Japan.

In September, 1940, after Japan's military alliance with Germany and Italy, the United States of America was forced to place limitations on the export of iron, steel and raw materials to Japan.

In March, 1941, conversations between the Japanese ambassador in Washington and the United States Secretary of State took place in an endeavour by the United States to settle outstanding differences and to reach a peaceful settlement. While these were proceeding Japan continued at a feverish pace to prepare for war. At an Imperial Conference on 2nd July, the decision to advance southward, obviously directed against the United States of America, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the British Commonwealth, was reached. At a further Conference on 6th September, it was decided to open hostilities against the United States of America, Great Britain and the Netherlands in case the requirements of Japan seemed unlikely to be realized by some time during the first part of October. On 1st December, a further Conference definitely decided on war. The decisions of the two last-mentioned Conferences were kept secret. On 7th-8th December, 1941, while negotiations were still proceeding, Japan made surprise attacks on territories of the United States of America at Pearl Harbour, of the British Commonwealth of Nations at Singapore, Malaya, Hong Kong and Shanghai, of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and of Thailand. She delivered no declaration of war, and to the British Commonwealth of Nations or to the Commonwealth of the Philippines, no document of any kind. To the United States of America she delivered, after the attack, a document which did not and was not intended to amount to a declaration of war.

She entirely disregarded all the other Treaty obligations referred to in Counts 7 and 8 hereof.

SECTION 10.

JAPAN, THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS AND
THE REPUBLIC OF PORTUGAL.

The Netherlands East Indies and the Portugese portion of the Island of Timor were within the area coveted by Japan and described by her as the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere".

In addition to the general treaties binding Japan not to attack these areas, Treaty Articles Nos. 20 and 21, refer respectively to these nations in terms. Japan also had a treaty with the Netherlands regarding the East Indies which she denounced on the 12th June, 1940, in preparation for aggression against them. At that time the homeland of the Netherlands had been recently and treacherously over-run by Japan's ally, Germany, and the Dutch Government had been compelled to seek refuge in England. Thereafter Japan endeavoured to compel that Government to agree to a new treaty on terms unduly favourable to Japan, but they were unwilling to do so. The preparations of Japan for a general aggressive war in the Far East included an intention to invade the Netherlands East Indies. The occupation by Japan of French Indo-China, completed in July, 1941, and the attacks upon territories of the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations on the 7th-8th December, 1941, were all part of a plan which included an invasion of the Netherlands East Indies. This was specifically one of the decisions of the Japanese Imperial Conference of the 6th September, 1941. Consequently the Netherlands Government immediately after the last mentioned attacks, declared war on Japan in self-defence.

On the 11th January, 1942, Japan invaded and thereafter rapidly occupied the Netherlands East Indies.

On 19th February, 1942, Japan, without any pretence of right or of any quarrel with the Republic of Portugal, invaded Portugese Timor, and occupied it for the purpose of carrying on her aggressive war against all the allied nations.

APPENDIX B.

List of Articles of Treaties violated by Japan
and incorporated in Groups One and Two.

The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes,
signed at The Hague 29 July 1899.

The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the Nations bringing the charges in this Indictment subject to certain reservations not here material.

1. Article I

"With a view to obviating, as far as possible, recourse to force in the relations between States, the Signatory Powers agree to use their best efforts to ensure the pacific settlement of international differences".

2. Article II

"In case of serious disagreement or conflict, before an appeal to arms, the Signatory Powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly Powers".

The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes,
signed at the Hague 18 October 1907.

The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment with the exception of the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, subject to certain reservations not here material.

3. Article 1.

"With a view to obviating as far as possible recourse to force in the relations between States, the Contracting Powers agree to use their best efforts to ensure the pacific settlement of international differences".

4. Article 2.

"In case of serious disagreement or dispute, before an appeal to arms, the Contracting Powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly Powers".

The Hague Convention No. III Relative to the Opening of Hostilities,
signed 18 October 1907.

The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the nations bringing the charge in this Indictment.

5. Article I

"The Contracting Powers recognize that hostilities between themselves must not commence without previous and explicit warning, in the form either of a reasoned declaration of war or of an ultimatum with conditional declaration of war".

Agreement effected by exchange of notes between the United States and
Japan, signed 30 November 1908, declaring their policy in the Far East.

6. "2. The Policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above-mentioned and to the defence of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

7. 3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

8. 4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all Powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

9. 5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take".

The Convention and Final Protocol for the Suppression of the Abuse of Opium and other Drugs, signed at The Hague, 23 January 1912 and 9 July 1913.

10. The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment.

The Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, signed at Versailles, 28 June 1919, known as the Versailles Treaty.

11. Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled".

12. Article 12 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"The Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to enquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the Council".

13. Article 13 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"The Members of the League agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration.

For the consideration of any such dispute, the court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such award, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto."

14. Article 15 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary-General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case, with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavour to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such a request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute."

15. Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and

religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defence of territory and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

There are territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centres of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above-mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population".

16. Article 23 (c) of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

"Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the Members of the League.....

(c) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs.

The Mandate from the League of Nations pursuant to the Versailles Treaty made at Geneva 17 December 1920.

17. Article 3.

"The Mandatory shall see that the slave trade is prohibited and that no forced labour is permitted, except for essential public works and services, and then only for adequate remuneration".

18. Article 4.

"The military training of the natives otherwise than for purposes of internal police and the local defence of the territory shall be prohibited. Furthermore, no military or naval bases shall be established or fortifications erected in the territory."

Treaty between the British Commonwealth of Nations, France, Japan and the United States of America relating to their Insular possessions and Insular Dominions in the Pacific Ocean, 13 December, 1921.

The said Treaty was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

19. Article I.

"The High Contracting Parties agree as between themselves to respect their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

If there should develop between any of the High Contracting Parties a controversy arising out of any Pacific question and involving their said rights which is not satisfactorily settled by diplomacy and is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between them, they shall invite the other High Contracting Parties to a joint Conference to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment".

Identic Communication made to the Netherlands Government on 4 February 1922 on behalf of the British Commonwealth of Nations and also "mutatis mutandis" on behalf of Japan and the other Powers signatory to the Quadruple Pacific Treaty of 13 December 1921, states that:-

20. The Netherlands not being signatory to the said Treaty, and the Netherlands possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean therefore not being included in the agreement referred to, His Britannic Majesty's Government, anxious to forestall any conclusion contrary to the spirit of the Treaty, desires to declare that it is firmly resolved to respect the rights of the Netherlands in relation to her insular possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

Identic Communication made to the Portuguese Government on 6 February 1922 on behalf of the British Commonwealth of Nations and also "mutatis mutandis" on behalf of Japan and the other Powers signatory to the Quadruple Pacific Treaty of 13 December 1921, states that:-

21. The Portuguese not being signatory to the said Treaty and the Portuguese possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean therefore not being included in the agreement referred to, His Britannic Majesty's Government, anxious to forestall any conclusion contrary to the spirit of the Treaty, desires to declare that it is firmly resolved to respect the rights of Portugal in relation to her insular possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

The Treaty between the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, Belgium, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal, concluded and signed at Washington, 6 February 1922, known as the Nine-Power Treaty.

The said Treaty was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Article I

"The Contracting Powers, other than China, agree:-

22. (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial administrative integrity of China;

23. (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable Government;

24. (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;

25. (4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States."

Article II.

26. "The Contracting Powers agree not to enter into any treaty, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, either with one another, or, individually or collectively, with any Power or Powers which would infringe or impair the principles stated in Article I."

Article III.

"With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the Open Door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all

nations, the Contracting Powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek, nor support their respective nationals in seeking:-

27. (a) Any arrangement which might purport to establish in favour of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China;

28. (b) Any such monopoly or preference as would deprive the nationals of any other Power of the right of undertaking any legitimate trade or industry in China, or of participating with the Chinese Government, or with any local authority, in any category or public enterprise, or which by reason of its scope, duration, or geographical extent is calculated to frustrate the practical application of the principle of equal opportunity.

It is understood that the foregoing stipulations of this Article are not to be so construed as to prohibit the acquisition of such properties or rights as may be necessary to the conduct of a particular commercial, industrial, or financial undertaking, or to the encouragement of invention and research.

China undertakes to be guided by the principles stated in the foregoing stipulations of this Article in dealing with applications for economic rights and privileges from the Governments and nationals of all foreign countries, whether parties to the present Treaty or not".

Article IV

29. "The Contracting Powers agree not to support any agreements by their respective nationals with each other designed to create Spheres of Influence or to provide for the enjoyment of mutually exclusive opportunities in designated parts of Chinese territory".

Article VII.

30. "The Contracting Powers agree that, whenever a situation arises which in the opinion of any one of them involves the application of the stipulations of the present Treaty, and renders desirable discussion of such application, there shall be full and frank communication between the Contracting Powers concerned."

Treaty between the United States and Japan, signed at Washington
11 February 1922.

The said Treaty was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

Article II.

31. "The United States and its nationals shall receive all the benefits of the engagements of Japan defined in Articles 3, 4 and 5 of the aforesaid Mandate, notwithstanding the fact that the United States is not a member of the League of Nations".

The League of Nations Second Opium Conference Convention, signed at Geneva
19 February 1925.

32. The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment, with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, and the United States of America.

Treaty between the President of the United States of America, the President of the German Reich, His Majesty the King of the Belgians, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, the President of the Republic of

Poland, and the President of the Czechoslovak Republic, concluded and signed at Paris 27 August 1928, known as the Kellogg-Briand Pact and as the Pact of Paris.

The said Treaty was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

Article I.

33. "The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another".

Article II

34. "The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means".

Declaration of Imperial Japanese Government, 27 June 1929, concerning Article I of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 27 August 1928.

"The Imperial Government declare that the phraseology "in the names of their respective peoples" appearing in Article I of the Treaty for the Renunciation of War, signed at Paris on 27 August 1928, viewed in the light of the provisions of the Imperial Constitution, is understood to be inapplicable in so far as Japan is concerned".

The Convention relating to Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva 13 July 1931.

35. The said Convention was signed and ratified by or on behalf of Japan with a reservation as recorded in the protocol of signature and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment, with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand.

Treaty between Thailand and Japan concerning the continuance of friendly relations and the mutual respect of each other's territorial integrity, signed at Tokyo, 12 June 1940.

The said Treaty was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

Article I.

36. "The High Contracting Parties shall mutually respect each other's territorial integrity and hereby reaffirm the constant peace and the perpetual friendship existing between them".

Convention respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons, in War on Land, signed at The Hague 18 October 1907.

37. Article I.

"The territory of neutral Powers is inviolable".

38. Article II.

"Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or convoys, whether of munitions of war or of supplies, across the territory of a neutral Power".

Treaty of Portsmouth between Russia and Japan, signed 5 September 1905 which established:

Article II (paragraph 3)

39. It is also agreed that in order to avoid all cause of misunderstanding

the two High Contracting Parties will abstain, on the Russo-Korean frontier, from taking any military measures which may menace the security of Russian or Korean territory.

Article III (Parts 1 and 2).

Japan and Russia mutually engage:

40. (1) To evacuate completely and simultaneously Manchuria except the territory affected by the lease of the Liaotung Peninsula, in conformity with the provisions of additional Article I, annexed to Treaty; and

41. (2) To restore entirely and completely to the exclusive administration of China all portions of Manchuria now in the occupation or under the control of the Japanese or Russian troops, with the exception of the territory above mentioned.

Article IV.

42. Japan and Russia reciprocally engage not to obstruct any general measures common to all countries, which China may take for the development of the commerce and industry of Manchuria.

Article VII (paragraph 1).

43. Japan and Russia engage to exploit their respective railways in Manchuria exclusively for commercial and industrial purposes and in no wise for strategic purposes.

Article IX (paragraph 2).

44. Japan and Russia mutually agree not to construct in their respective possessions on the Island of Saghalien or the adjacent islands, any fortifications or other similar military works. They also respectively engage not to take any military measures which may impede the free navigation of the Straits of La Perouse and Tartary.

The Convention on Embodying Basic Rules of the Relations between Japan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed 20 January 1925 in Peking.

This Convention was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

Article V.

45. The High Contracting Parties solemnly affirm their desire and intention to live in peace and amity with each other, scrupulously to respect the undoubted right of a State to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way, to refrain and restrain all persons in any governmental service for them, and all organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from them, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatever to endanger the order and security in any part of the territories of Japan or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is further agreed that neither Contracting Party shall permit the presence in the territories under its jurisdiction -- (a) of organizations or groups pretending to be the Government for any part of the territories of the other Party, or (b) of alien subjects or citizens who may be found to be actually carrying on political activities for such organizations or groups.

The Neutrality Pact between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Japan, signed 13 April 1941 in Moscow.

This pact was signed and ratified by the Signatory Powers.

Article I.

46. Both Contracting Parties engage to maintain peaceful and friendly relations between themselves and mutually respect the territorial integrity and inviolability of the other Contracting Party.

Article II.

47. If one of the Contracting Parties becomes the object of military action on the part of one or several other Powers, the other Contracting Party will maintain neutrality during the whole period of the conflict.

APPENDIX C.

List of Official Assurances Violated by Japan and incorporated in Group One.

1. 25th September, 1931: That Japan had no territorial designs in Manchuria.
2. 25th November, 1931: That there was no truth in the report of a Japanese advance on Chinchow.
3. 22nd December, 1931: That Chinese sovereignty would be accepted and that the open door policy would be maintained.
4. 5th January, 1933: That Japan had no territorial ambitions south of the Great Wall in China.
5. 25th April, 1934: That Japan had no intention whatever of seeking special privileges in China, of encroaching upon the territorial and administrative integrity of China, or of creating difficulties for the bona fide trade of other countries with China.
6. 15th August, 1937: That Japan harboured no territorial designs on China and would spare no efforts in safeguarding foreign interest and rights in China.
7. September, 1937: That Japan had peaceful intentions and a lack of territorial designs in North China.
8. 17th February, 1939: That Japan had no territorial designs in China and that the occupation would not go beyond military necessity.
9. 26th August, 1939: That Japan had decided to abandon any further negotiations with Germany and Italy relative to closer relations under the Anti-Comintern Pact.
10. 15th April, 1940: That Japan desired status quo of the Netherlands East Indies.
11. 16th May, 1940: That Japan had no plans nor purpose to attack the Netherlands East Indies.
12. 24th March, 1941: That under no circumstances would Japan attack the United States of America, Great Britain or the Netherlands East Indies.
13. 8th July, 1941: That Japan had not so far considered the possibility of fighting the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
14. 10th July, 1941: That Japan contemplated no action against French Indo-China.
15. 5th December, 1941: That troop movements in French Indo-China were precautionary measures.

APPENDIX D

Incorporated in Group Three

The Laws and Customs of War are established partly by the practice of civilised nations, and partly by Conventions and Assurances, which are either directly binding upon the parties thereto, or evidence of the established and recognised rules. The Conventions and Assurances hereinafter mentioned in any part of this Appendix will be relied upon as a whole for both purposes, only the most material Articles being quoted herein.

1. The Convention No. 4 done at the Hague on the 18th October, 1907, concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land provides (inter alia) as follows:

"According to the views of the High Contracting Parties, these provisions, the drafting of which has been inspired by the desire to diminish the evils of war, so far as military requirements permit, are intended to serve as a general rule of conduct for the belligerents in their relations with the inhabitants.

It has not, however, been found possible at present to concert stipulations covering all the circumstances which arise in practice;

On the other hand, the High Contracting Parties clearly do not intend that unforeseen cases should, in default of written agreement, be left to the arbitrary opinion of military commanders.

Until a more complete code of the laws of war can be drawn up, the High Contracting Parties deem it expedient to declare that, in cases not covered by the rules adopted by them, the inhabitants and the belligerents remain under the protection and governance of the principles of the law of nations, derived from the usages established among civilized peoples, from the laws of humanity, and from the dictates of the public conscience."

The Regulations set out in the Annex to the said Convention, which forms part thereof, deal in Section I with Belligerents and Prisoners of War, in Section II with Hostilities and in Section III with Military Authority over the Territory of the Hostile State.

Article 4 thereof in Section I provides (inter alia) as follows:

"Prisoners of War are in the power of the hostile Government, but not of the individuals or corps who capture them."

Convention No. 10 done at the same time and place concerns Maritime War.

The said Conventions were signed and ratified by or on behalf of over forty nations, including Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this Indictment, subject to certain reservations not here material, and thus became part or evidence of the Laws and Customs of War.

2. The more complete code of the Laws of War contemplated by the said Convention is contained, in relation to Prisoners of War, in the International Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, done at Geneva, on the 27th July, 1929, (hereinafter called "the Geneva Convention").

Although Japan did not ratify the said Convention, it became

ing upon her for one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) It was signed on the said date by or on behalf of forty-seven nations, including Japan and each of the nations bringing the charges in this indictment, and ratified by over forty nations, and thus became part or evidence of the Laws and Customs of War.
- (b) A communication dated the 29th January, 1942, signed by TOGO, Shigenori, one of the accused, as Foreign Minister on behalf of Japan, addressed to the Swiss Minister in Tokyo, contained the following statement:

"Although not bound by the Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, Japan will apply *mutatis mutandis*, the provisions of that Convention to American prisoners of war."

In a communication dated on or about the 30th January, 1942, addressed to the Argentine Minister in Tokyo by TOGO, Shigenori, one of the accused, as Foreign Minister on behalf of Japan, it is stated:

"The Imperial Government has not yet ratified the Convention of 27th July, 1929, regarding the treatment of prisoners of war. They are not therefore subject to the said Convention. None the less, they will apply *mutatis mutandis* the conditions of that Convention to English, Canadian, Australian and New Zealand prisoners of war in their power. With regard to supply of food and clothing to prisoners of war, they will consider on condition of reciprocity national and racial customs of the prisoners."

By the said communications or one of them, Japan acceded to the said Convention in accordance with Article 95 thereof, and the state of war then existing gave immediate effect to such accession.

- (c) The said communications constituted assurances to the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, to whose governments the said communications were intended to be, and were, repeated by the respective recipients thereof, and in each case to all nations who were at war with Japan.

Except in the said matters there are no provisions of the said Geneva Convention to which the expression "*mutatis mutandis*" could properly be applied.

3. The International Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armies in the Field, done at Geneva on the 27th July, 1929, (known as and hereinafter called 'the Red Cross Convention') provides (*inter alia*) as follows:

"Article 26: The Commanders-in-Chief of belligerent armies shall arrange the details for carrying out the preceding articles, as well as for cases not provided for, in accordance with the instructions of their respective Governments and in conformity with the general principles of the present Convention."

Japan was a party to the said Convention, together with over forty other nations, which thus became part or evidence of the Laws and Customs of War. In the above-mentioned communication dated on or about the 29th January, 1942, Japan stated:

"Japan observes strictly the Geneva Convention of 27th July, 1929, relative to the Red Cross, as a state signatory of that Convention."

A communication dated the 13th February, 1942, signed by TOGO, Shigenori, one of the accused, as Foreign Minister on behalf of Japan, addressed to the Swiss Minister in Tokyo, contained the following statement:

"The Imperial Government will apply during the present war, on condition of reciprocity, the provisions relative to the treatment of prisoners of war of the 27th July, 1929, to enemy civilian internees, as far as applicable to them, and provided that labour will not be imposed upon them contrary to their free choice."

The said communication constituted an assurance to all the nations at war with Japan, (who in fact carried out the provisions of the said Convention as applicable to Japanese civilian internees) other than the Republic of China.

The above-mentioned assurances were repeated by the Japanese Foreign Ministry on several occasions, as recently as the 26th May, 1943.

PARTICULARS OF BREACHES

All the offences are breaches of the Laws and Customs of War, in addition to, and as proved in part by, the several Articles of the Conventions and assurances specifically mentioned.

SECTION ONE

Inhumane treatment, contrary in each case to Article 4 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention and the whole of the said Geneva Convention and to the said assurances. In addition to the inhumane treatment alleged in Sections Two to Six hereof inclusive, which are incorporated in this Section, prisoners of war and civilian internees were murdered, beaten, tortured and otherwise ill-treated, and female prisoners were raped by members of the Japanese forces.

SECTION TWO

Illegal employment of prisoner of war labour, contrary in each case to Article 6 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention and to Part III of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances. The said employment was illegal in that:

- (a) prisoners of war were employed on work having connection and direct connection with the operations of war.
- (b) prisoners of war were employed on work for which they were physically unsuited, and on work which was unhealthy and dangerous.
- (c) the duration of daily work was excessive, and prisoners were not allowed rests of twenty-four consecutive hours in each week.
- (d) conditions of work were rendered more arduous by disciplinary measures.
- (e) prisoners were kept and compelled to work in unhealthy climates and dangerous zones, and without sufficient food, clothing or boots.

SECTION THREE

Refusal and failure to maintain prisoners of war, contrary to Article 7 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention, and Article 4 and Part III, Articles 9 - 12 inclusive, of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances.

Owing to differences of national and racial customs, the food and clothing supplied to the Japanese troops were, even when supplied to prisoners of war belonging to the white races, insufficient to maintain them. Adequate food and clothing were not supplied, either in accordance with the said Conventions or the said assurances.

The structural and sanitary condition of the camps and labour detachments failed entirely to comply with the said Articles and was extremely bad, unhealthy and inadequate.

Washing and drinking facilities were inadequate and bad.

SECTION FOUR

Excessive and illegal punishment of prisoners of war, contrary to Article 8 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention and to Part III, Section V, Chapter 3 of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances:

- (a) Prisoners of war were killed, beaten and tortured without trial or investigation of any kind, for alleged offences;
- (b) such unauthorised punishments were inflicted for alleged offences which, even if proved, were not under the said Conventions offences at all;
- (c) collective punishments were imposed for individual alleged offences;
- (d) prisoners were sentenced to punishment more severe than imprisonment for thirty days for attempting to escape;
- (e) conditions of the trial of prisoners did not conform to those laid down in the said Chapter;
- (f) conditions of imprisonment of prisoners sentenced did not conform to those laid down in the said Chapter.

SECTION FIVE

Mistreatment of the sick and wounded, medical personnel and female nurses, contrary to Articles 3, 14, 15 and 25 of the said Geneva Convention and Articles 1, 9, 10 and 12 of the said Red Cross Convention, and to the said assurances:

- (a) Officers and soldiers who were wounded or sick, medical personnel, chaplains, and personnel of voluntary aid Societies were not respected or protected, but were murdered, ill-treated and neglected;
- (b) medical personnel, chaplains and personnel of voluntary aid Societies were wrongfully retained in Japanese hands;
- (c) female nurses were raped, murdered and ill-treated.

- (d) camps did not possess infirmaries, and seriously sick prisoners and those requiring important surgical treatment were not admitted to military or civil institutions qualified to treat them;
- (e) monthly medical inspections were not arranged;
- (f) sick and wounded prisoners were transferred although their recovery was prejudiced by their journeys.

SECTION SIX

Humiliation of prisoners of war, and especially officers, contrary to Article 8 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention, and Articles 2, 3, 18, 21, 22 and 27 of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances:

- (a) Prisoners were deliberately kept and made to work in territories occupied by Japan, for the purpose of exposing them to the insults and curiosity of the inhabitants;
- (b) prisoners in Japan and in occupied territories, including officers, were compelled to work on menial tasks and exposed to public view;
- (c) officer prisoners were placed under the control of non-commissioned officers and private soldiers and compelled to salute them, and to work.

SECTION SEVEN

Refusal or failure to collect and transmit information regarding prisoners of war, and replies to enquiries on the subject, contrary to Article 14 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention and to Articles 8 and 77 of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances:

Proper records were not kept, nor information supplied as required by the said Articles, and the most important of such records as were kept were deliberately destroyed.

SECTION EIGHT

Obstructions of the rights of the Protecting Powers, of Red Cross Societies, of prisoners of war and of their representatives, contrary to Article 15 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention, and to Articles 31, 42, 44, 78 and 86 of the said Geneva Convention, and to the said assurances:

- (a) The representatives of the Protecting Power (Switzerland) were refused or not granted permission to visit camps and access to premises occupied by prisoners;
- (b) when such permission was granted they were not allowed to hold conversation with prisoners without witnesses or at all;
- (c) on such occasions conditions in camps were deceptively prepared to appear better than normal, and prisoners were threatened with punishment if they complained;

- (d) prisoners and their representatives were not allowed to make complaints as to the nature of their work or otherwise, or to correspond freely with the military authorities or the Protecting Power;
- (e) Red Cross parcels and mail were withheld.

SECTION NINE

Employing poison, contrary to the International Declaration respecting Asphyxiating Gases signed by (inter alia) Japan and China at the Hague on the 29th July, 1899, and to Article 23(a) of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention, and to Article 171 of the Treaty of Versailles;

In the wars of Japan against the Republic of China, poison gas was used. This allegation is confined to that country.

SECTION TEN

Killing enemies who, having laid down their arms or no longer having means of defence, had surrendered at discretion, contrary to Article 23(c) of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention.

SECTION ELEVEN

Destruction of Enemy Property, without military justification or necessity, and Pillage, contrary to Articles 23(g), 28 and 47 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention.

SECTION TWELVE

Failure to respect family honour and rights, individual life, private property and religious convictions and worship in occupied territories, and deportation and enslavement of the inhabitants thereof, contrary to Articles 46 of the said Annex to the said Hague Convention and to the Laws and Customs of War:

Large numbers of the inhabitants of such territories were murdered, tortured, raped and otherwise ill-treated, arrested and interned without justification, sent to forced labour, and their property destroyed or confiscated.

SECTION THIRTEEN

Killing survivors of ships sunk by naval action and crews of captured ships, contrary to Article 16 of Hague Convention No. 10 of 1907.

SECTION FOURTEEN

Failure to respect military hospital ships, contrary to Article 1 of the last-mentioned Convention, and unlawful use of Japanese hospital ships, contrary to Articles 6 and 8 thereof.

SECTION FIFTEEN

Attacks, and especially attacks without due warning, upon neutral ships.

APPENDIX E.

Statement of Individual Responsibility for Crimes Set Out in the Indictment.

The statements hereinafter set forth following the name of each individual Defendant constitute matters upon which the Prosecution will rely inter alia as establishing the individual responsibility of the Defendants.

It is charged against each of the Defendants that he used the power and prestige of the position which he held and his personal influence in such a manner that he promoted and carried out the offences set out in each Count of this Indictment in which his name appears.

It is charged against each of the Defendants that during the periods hereinafter set out against his name he was one of those responsible for all the acts and omissions of the various Governments of which he was a member, and of the various civil, military or naval organizations in which he held a position of authority.

It is charged against each of the Defendants, as shown by the numbers given after his name, that he was present at and concurred in the decisions taken at some of the conferences and cabinet meetings held on or about the following dates in 1941, which decisions prepared for and led to unlawful war on 7th/8th December, 1941.

1.	25th June, 1941	(Liaison)
2.	26th June, 1941	(Liaison)
3.	27th June, 1941	(Liaison)
4.	28th June, 1941	(Liaison)
5.	30th June, 1941	(Supreme War Council)
6.	2nd July, 1941	(Imperial)
7.	7th August, 1941	(Thought Control Council)
8.	22nd August, 1941	(Cabinet)
9.	6th September, 1941	(Imperial)
10.	17th October, 1941	(Ex-Premiers)
11.	28th November, 1941	(Liaison)
12.	29th November, 1941	(Ex-Premiers)
13.	1st December, 1941	(Imperial)
14.	1st December, 1941	(Cabinet)

ARAKI:

The Defendant ARAKI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief of General Affairs Department of the Office of Inspector General of Military Training (1931); Minister of War under INUKAI and SAITO (December 1931 to July 1934); a full General (1933); Member of the Supreme War Council (1934 to 1936); Member of the Cabinet Advisory Council on China (1937); Education Minister under KONOYE and then under HIRANUMA (May 1938 to August 1939); Member of the Cabinet Advisory Council (1940)..

DOHIHARA:

The Defendant DOHIHARA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Commander of the Special Service Section in Manchuria (September 1931); Mayor of Mukden (September to October 1931); attached to Headquarters, Kwantung Army (1933); Chief Adviser to the North China autonomous Government; Commander-in-Chief Japanese 5th Army Manchuria (1938 to 1940); Supreme War Councillor (1940 to 1943); Inspector General of Military Aviation (1941); full General (April 1941); Commander-in-Chief Eastern Army in Japan (1943); Commander of the 7th Area Army at Singapore (1944 to 1945); Inspector General Military Training (April 1945).

Conferences:- 5.

HASHIMOTO:

The Defendant HASHIMOTO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- attached Army General Staff (1933); retired from Army (February 1936); author of "Declarations of HASHIMOTO Kingoro" (1936); re-entered the Army (1937); commanded an Artillery Regiment at the Rape of Nanking (1937); in command of Japanese forces which shelled the Ladybird and the Panay (1937); author of a large number of books, articles in the magazine "Taiyo Dai Nippon" and other publications and public speeches, all advocating aggressive warfare; member of a number of societies for the instigation of army control over politics and furtherance of aggressive warfare; promoter of a number of plots designed to remove politicians and officers whom he did not consider sufficiently aggressive; a founder of the I.R.A.A. (1940); elected to the Lower House of the Diet (1942).

HATA:

The Defendant HATA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Divisional Commander in Manchuria (1933); Chief of Army Aviation Department (1935); Commander of the Taiwan Army (1936 to 1937); Inspector General of Military Education and Member of the Supreme War Council (August 1937); a full General (February 1937); Commander-in-Chief of the Expeditionary Force in Central China (February 1938); Member of the Supreme War Council (January 1939); War Minister under ABE (August 1939 to January 1940); Commander-in-Chief of the Expeditionary Force in Central China (July 1940 to 1944); Field Marshall and Member of the Board of Marshals and Admirals (June 1944); Inspector General of Military Education (November 1944).

HIRANUMA:

The Defendant HIRANUMA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Founder of the KOKUHONSHA and President from 1926 to 1936; Vice President of Privy Council (1930 to 1936); President of Privy Council (1936 to 1939); Prime Minister (January to August 1939); Minister without Portfolio under KONOYE and for a time Home Minister and later Vice-Premier (July 1940 to October 1941); Member of Thought Control Council (August 1941); President Privy Council (1945).

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.6.7.8.12.

HIROTA:

The Defendant HIROTA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (1930); Foreign Minister (September 1933 to July 1934) under SAITO, and from July 1934 to March 1936 under OKADA; Prime Minister and for a time Foreign Minister concurrently (March 1936 to February 1937); Foreign Minister under KONOYE (June 1937 to May 1938); Member of the Cabinet Advisory Council (1940).

Conferences:- 10.12.

HOSHINO:

The Defendant HOSHINO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief General Affairs Bureau of the Finance Department of the Manchukuo Government (1932); Chief of General Affairs in the Finance Ministry of Manchukuo (1934); Vice Minister Finance in the Manchukuo Government (1936); Chief, General Affairs Bureau in the National Affairs Office of Manchukuo (December 1936); Chief of General Affairs in Manchukuo (July 1938); President of the Planning Board and later Minister without Portfolio under KONOYE (July 1940 to April 1941); Chief Secretary and Minister of State under TOJO (October 16th, 1941 to July 1944); Adviser to Finance Ministry (December 1944).

Conferences:- 11.14.

ITAGAKI:

The Defendant ITAGAKI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- full Colonel Kwantung Army (1929); Major General, Kwantung Army (1932); Vice Chief of Staff, Kwantung Army (1934); Commander 5th Division in China (March 1937); Chief of Staff, Kwantung Army (1936 to 1937); attached to Headquarters, General Staff (May 1937); War Minister under KONOYE and HIRANUMA from June 1938 to August 1939 and concurrently President of the Manchurian Affairs Bureau of the Cabinet; Chief of Staff, Japanese Army in China (September 1939); full General (July 1941); Commander, Japanese Army in Korea (July 1941 to 1945); Member of Supreme War Council (1943); Commander 7th Area Army in Singapore (April 1945).

KAYA:

The Defendant KAYA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief Secretary, Finance Ministry (1934); Minister of Finance (June 1937 to May 1938) under KONOYE; on the Advisory Committee, China Affairs Board (1939); President, North China Development Company (1939 to 1941); Finance Minister under TOJO (June 1941 to February 1944); Director I.R.A.P.S. (1944).

Conferences:- 11.12.13.14.

KIDO:

The Defendant KIDO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal (1930); Education Minister under KONOYE (1937); Welfare Minister under KONOYE (1938); Home Minister under HIRANUMA (1939); Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal (1940 to 1945); chief confidential advisor to the Emperor and presided at meetings of Ex-Premiers.

Conferences:- 10.12.

KIMURA:

The Defendant KIMURA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief of Staff, Kwantung Army (1940); Vice War Minister under KONOYE and TOJO (1941 to February 1944); Member Supreme War Council (1943); Commander in Chief Japanese Army, Burma (1944); full General (1945).

KOISO:

The Defendant KOISO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Director, Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry (1930); Vice War Minister under INUKAI (1932); Chief of Staff, Kwantung Army (1932 to 1934); Commander Japanese Army, Korea (1935 to 1936); a full General (1937); Overseas Minister under HIRANUMA (1939) and under YONAI (1940); Governor General Korea (May 1942); Prime Minister (July 1944 to April 1945).

MATSUI:

The Defendant MATSUI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Representative of the Japanese Army at the Geneva Conference (1931); Member of the Supreme War Council (March 1933); a full General (1933); a founder of the Greater East Asia Society (1933); Commander-in-Chief, Japanese Forces in Central China (October 1937 to February 1938); Member of the Cabinet Advisory Council (July 1938 to January 1940); Adviser to the Asia Promotion Federation (1940); Adviser to the Greater East Asia Affairs Section of the I.R.A.A. (1943); President of the Greater East Asia Development Society (1944).

MATSUOKA:

The Defendant MATSUOKA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief Delegate to the League of Nations Assembly (1933); President of the South Manchurian Railway (1935 to 1939); Member of the Cabinet Advisory Council (1940); Foreign Minister under KONOYE (July 1940 to July 1941); author of "Showa Restoration" (1938) and other books and articles and public speeches advocating aggressive warfare.

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.6.

MINAMI:

The Defendant MINAMI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Commander, Japanese Army, Korea (1929); War Minister under WAKATSUKI (April 1931 to December 1931); Supreme War Councillor (1931 to 1934); Commander in Chief, Kwantung Army (1934 to 1936); Governor General of Korea (1936 to 1942); Member of the Privy Council (1942 to 1945); President of the Political Association of Great Japan (1945).

MUTO:

The Defendant MUTO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Instructor at the Military Staff College (1930 to 1932); Senior Officer of the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry (1935 to 1936); Chief of a section of the General Staff (1937); attached Headquarters Staff, Central China Army (August 1937); Colonel, attached to Kwantung Army Headquarters; Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau (October 1939 to April 1942); commanded 2nd Guards Division in Sumatra (1943); Chief of Staff of the 14th Area Army in the Philippines under General Yamashita (October 1944).

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.6.9.11.13.

NAGANO:

The Defendant NAGANO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Vice Chief, Naval General Staff (1930); Delegate to the Geneva Naval Conference (1931); Member Supreme War Council (1933); full Admiral (1934); Chief Delegate to London Naval Conference (1935); Navy Minister under HIROTA (March 1936 to February 1937); Commander-in-Chief of Combined Fleet (1937); Member of Supreme War Council (1940); Chief of Naval General Staff (April 1941 to February 1944); Supreme Naval Adviser to the Emperor from February 1944.

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.6.9.11.13.

OKA:

The Defendant OKA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- on the Naval General Staff (1930); Section Chief, General and Military Affairs Bureau of the Navy (1938); Chief, General and Military Affairs Bureau of the Navy (October 1940 to August 1944); Vice Admiral (1942); Vice Navy Minister (20 July 1944) under KOISO; Commander-in-Chief Chinkai (Korea) Naval Station (September 1944 to June 1945);

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.6.9.11.13.

OKAWA:

The Defendant OKAWA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Director General of the East Asia Research Institute of the South Manchurian Railway from 1926; an organizer of the Mukden Incident (September 18th, 1931); author of "A Japanese History Reader" (1935); and of books, articles and speeches advocating aggressive war for the expulsion by force of the white races from Asia.

OSHIMA:

The Defendant OSHIMA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Military Attache in Berlin (1936); Ambassador to Germany (October 1938 to October 1939); and again from February 1941 to April 1945.

SATO:

The Defendant SATO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Instructor, Army General Staff College (1935); attached to the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry; Member of the Planning Board (1937 to 1938); Chief of the Military Affairs Section of the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry (February 1941 to April 1942); Major General (October 1941); Chief of Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry (April 1942 to December 1944); Lieutenant General (March 1945).

SHIGEMITSU:

The Defendant SHIGEMITSU between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Minister to China (1931); Vice Foreign Minister under SAITO and OKADA (1933 to 1936); Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 1936 to November 1938); Ambassador to Great Britain (1938 to June 1941); Ambassador to the Nanking Puppet Government (December 1941 to April 1943); Foreign Minister under TOJO (April 1943 to July 1944) and Foreign Minister and concurrently Minister for Greater East Asia under KOISO (July 1944 to April 1945).

SHIMADA:

The Defendant SHIMADA between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief of Staff, Combined Fleet (1930); Vice Chief, Naval General Staff (1935 to 1937); Commander of the Second Fleet (December 1937); Commander, China Fleet (May 1940); full Admiral (1940); Navy Minister under TOJO (October 1941); appointed to Supreme War Council (1944); Chief of Naval General Staff (February to July 1944).

Conferences:- 12.13.14.

SHIRATORI:

The Defendant SHIRATORI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief of Information Bureau of the Foreign Office (1930); Minister to Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland (1936); Ambassador to Italy (1939); Adviser, Japanese Foreign Office (1940); author of an article in "Contemporary Japan" pointing out the necessity of a World Conflict to establish the "New Order in Asia" (April 16, 1941); Director I.R.A.P.S. (1943).

SUZUKI:

The Defendant SUZUKI between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Member of the Military Affairs Section of the War Ministry (1931); attached to the Bureau of Military Affairs of the War

Department (1933); Official of the Investigation Bureau of the Cabinet (1935); Regimental Commander of the 14th Regiment (1936); Chief of the Political Affairs Division of the China Affairs Board (December 1938 to April 1941); acting Director General thereof in 1940; President of the Cabinet Planning Board and Minister without Portfolio (April 1941 to October 1943) under KONOYE and TOJO; Cabinet Adviser (November 1943 to September 1944); Director of the I.R.A.A. (1944).

Conferences:- 6.8.9.11.13.14.

TOGO:

The Defendant TOGO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Ambassador to Germany (October 1937); Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 1938); Foreign Minister and Minister for Overseas Affairs under TOJO (October 1941 to March 1942); Foreign Minister and Minister of Greater East Asia under SUZUKI (April 1945).

Conferences:- 11.12.13.14.

TOJO:

The Defendant TOJO between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Head of the First Section of the General Staff (1931 to 1932); Chief of the Investigation Section of the Army Communications School (1932); Commander of the Military Police of the Kwantung Army (1935); Chief of Staff, Kwantung Army (1937); Vice War Minister under KONOYE (May to December 1938); Director General of Military Aviation (1938 to 1939); War Minister under KONOYE (July 1940 to December 1941); full General (October 1940); Prime Minister and War Minister concurrently (December 2, 1941 to July 1944) - during which period he was also, at times, Home Minister, Minister of Munitions, and Chief of General Staff.

Conferences:- 1.2.3.4.5.6.8.9.11.12.13.14.

UMEZU:

The Defendant UMEZU between 1928 and 1945 was, among other positions held:- Chief of the General Affairs Department of the War Ministry (1931); Commander of the Japanese Forces in China (1934); Vice War Minister under HIROTA, HAYASHI and KONOYE (March 1936 to May 1938); Commander of the Kwantung Army and Ambassador to Manchukuo (1939 to 1944); full General (1940); Chief of General Staff (July 1944 to 1945).

ERRATUM

COUNT 52.

The following Count 52 is substituted for Count 52 as it appears on page 12 of the Indictment:

The Defendants ARAKI, DOHIHARA, HATA, HIRANUMA, HIROTA, HOSHINO, ITAGAKI, KIDO, MATSUOKA, MATSUI, SHIGEMITSU, SUZUKI and TOJO by ordering, causing and permitting the armed forces of Japan to attack the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with which nation Japan was then at peace, (in the region of Lake Khasan in the months of July and August 1938) unlawfully killed and murdered certain members of the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose names and number are at present unknown.